

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on June 5, 2003, claims 3-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,807) ("Bretschneider"). The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-14, 16, and 17 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 12-14 and 17 are independent claims.

Amendments to the Claims:

Dependent claim 11 is canceled herein, and independent claims 12-14 and 17 are amended herein to include the features of claim 11. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Rejections of the Claims:

Difference Between The Claimed Invention And The Cited Reference:

In the examiner's Response to Arguments, on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the examiner cites column 9, line 64 et seq. as discussing programming a predetermined sequence of slides. The examiner continues to assert that the use of sequence numbers would have been obvious to someone skilled in the art.

In regard to the feature of canceled claim 11 that was amended into the independent claims, Bretschneider is limited to the web page information being stored on a remote computer (Bretschneider, col. 10, lines 2-7). Disadvantageously, Bretschneider requires a connection to a network or ISP. In contrast, one of the advantages of the present invention is that Internet access is not required during presentation of the slide show because the web page information is downloaded and stored as a local file (Specification, p. 10, lines 6-9).

Specifically, independent claims 12-14 of the subject application (as amended herein) recite "storing the web page information to be outputted corresponding to address information, wherein the web page information which is stored is obtained using address information." Independent claim 17 of the subject application (as amended herein) recites "a storage unit to store the web page information to be outputted corresponding to address information, wherein the browser unit obtains the web page information which is stored in the storage unit using

address information informed by the control unit."

Therefore, independent claims 12-14 and 17 of the subject application (as amended herein) are patentably distinguishable over Bretschneider. In addition, dependent claims 3-10 and 16 are allowable based in part on their dependency, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 12-14 and 17.

The Finality Of The Office Action Is Improper:

The examiner only provided his detailed rejection of independent claim 17, and then stated that independent claims 12-14 were of the same scope. However, each independent claim is of a different scope. In addition, the examiner did not provide his detailed reasons for rejecting dependent claims 3-5 and 10-11; instead, the examiner simply listed them on the Office Action Summary as rejected. Therefore, the examiner failed to properly reject dependent claims 3-5 and 10-11, and thus the finality of the current Office Action is improper.


Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10.6.2003

By: 
Matthew Q. Ammon
Registration No. 50,346

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500